

Patent Application No. 10/056,546

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated January 24, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 USC §102. By this Amendment, claims 1, 16, and 22 are amended, and claims 23-28 are added. Currently pending claims 1-28 are believed allowable, with claims 1, 16 and 22 being independent claims.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102**

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,804,684 to Stubler et al. (hereinafter "Stubler"). Office Action, page 2, paragraph 4.

Before addressing the subject matter of the claims, a general discussion of the present invention and of Stubler may assist review of the pending application.

The present invention relates to efficient interactive annotation or labeling of multimedia content to facilitate effective searching, filtering and usage of content. Application, page 1, lines 4-6. In one embodiment of the invention, efficiency is realized by prompting a user to annotate only a small set of selected example content, with the results propagated to the annotation of a maximum number of other multimedia content. Application, page 4, lines 11-14, page 7, lines 2-4. This causes the user to annotate as few examples as possible. Application, page 5, lines 7-8.

Stubler appears to relate to a method for associating captions with images in an image database environment. Stubler, col. 1, lines 7-10. Briefly, the captioning technique of Stubler involves acquiring an image for evaluation with respect to stored images, automatically extracting metadata from the acquired image, automatically selecting one or more stored images having metadata similar to the extracted metadata, and generating one or more captions for the acquired image from preexisting captions associated with the selected stored images. Stubler, col. 3, lines 15-32. Although Stubler discusses an optional feature for user verification of extended captioning or semantic labeling, there is no teaching of actively selecting examples of

Patent Application No. 10/056,546

multimedia content to achieve the annotation of a maximum number of other multimedia content. Stubler, col. 8, lines 40-55.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended to recite, in part, "actively selecting examples of multimedia content to be annotated by a user, wherein the examples of multimedia content are selected based on at least one criterion for achieving a maximal disambiguation result." Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 5, lines 4-9 and page 7, lines 2-4.

Although Stubler discusses an optional feature for user verification of extended captioning or semantic labeling, there is no teaching of actively selecting examples of multimedia content to be annotated by a user for achieving a maximal disambiguation result. Stubler, col. 8, lines 40-55. Thus, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable and earnestly solicits such allowance.

Claims 2-15, 23, and 24

Claims 2-15, 23 and 24 are dependent on and further limit claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed allowable, claims 2-15, 23 and 24 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 16

Claim 16 is amended to recite, in part, "means for actively selecting examples of multimedia content to be annotated by a user, wherein the examples of multimedia content are selected based on at least one criterion for achieving a maximal disambiguation result." Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 5, lines 4-9 and page 7, lines 2-4.

Although Stubler discusses an optional feature for user verification of extended captioning or semantic labeling, there is no teaching of actively selecting examples of multimedia content to be annotated by a user for achieving a maximal disambiguation result. Stubler, col. 8, lines 40-55. Thus, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable and earnestly solicits such allowance.

Patent Application No. 10/056,546

Claims 17-21, 25 and 26

Claims 17-21, 25 and 26 are dependent on and further limit claim 16. Since claim 16 is believed allowable, claims 17-21, 25 and 26 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

Claim 22

Claim 22 is amended to recite, in part, "selecting of examples of multimedia content to be annotated by a user, wherein the examples of multimedia content are selected based on at least one criterion for achieving a maximal disambiguation result." Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 5, lines 4-9 and page 7, lines 2-4.

Although Stubler discusses an optional feature for user verification of extended captioning or semantic labeling, there is no teaching of actively selecting examples of multimedia content to be annotated by a user for achieving a maximal disambiguation result. Stubler, col. 8, lines 40-55. Thus, for at least this reason, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 is allowable and earnestly solicits such allowance.

Claims 27 and 28

Claims 27 and 28 are dependent on and further limit claim 22. Since claim 22 is believed allowable, claims 27 and 28 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 22.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 23, 25 and 27 recite, in part, "wherein the at least one criterion includes an ambiguity level of the selected examples." No new matter is believed to be introduced by these claims and support for their subject matter can be found at least at page 5, line 13 and page 7, lines 1-2 of the present Application.

New claims 24, 26 and 28 recite, in part, "wherein the at least one criterion includes a confidence level of the selected examples, the confidence level being inversely proportional to a distance of a new feature of the selected examples from a separating hyperplane in an induced higher dimensional feature space." No new matter is believed to be introduced by these claims and support for their subject matter

Patent Application No. 10/056,546

can be found at least at page 14, lines 6-10 of the present Application.


#### CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this case is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain at issue that the Examiner feels could best be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below.

Please charge Deposit Account 50-0510 a fee \$300 for the six additional dependent claims introduced by this Amendment. No other fee is believed due with this Amendment, however, should a fee be required please charge Deposit Account 50-0510. Should any extensions of time be required, please consider this a petition thereof and charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2005

  
Ido Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924  
Law Office of Ido Tuchman  
69-60 108th Street, Suite 503  
Forest Hills, NY 11375  
Telephone (718) 544-1110  
Facsimile (718) 544-8588

PATENT

Attorney Docket No. YOR920020018US1

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Sankar BASU et al.

Serial No: 10/056,546

Filed: January 24, 2002

For: A METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR  
ACTIVE ANNOTATION OF MULTIMEDIA  
CONTENT

Examiner: SMITH, Peter J.

Art Unit: 2176

## FEE CALCULATION SHEET

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith for filing is an amendment in the above-identified application. The fee has been calculated as shown below:

	(Col. 1)		(Col. 2)	(Col. 3)	OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY	
	CLAIMS REMAING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL	28	MINUS	22	= 6	x 50 =	\$ 300
INDEP.	3	MINUS	3	= 0	x 200 =	\$
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM					+ 300 =	\$
					TOTAL	\$ 300


☒ Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0510 in the amount of \$ 300.

☐ A check in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ is attached.

☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2005

  
Ido Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924  
69-60 108th Street, Suite 503  
Forest Hills, NY 11375  
Telephone (718) 544-1110  
Facsimile (718) 544-8588